

In the present case, the claims contemplate that information regarding a mobile station requesting authentication is to be displayed to a LAN administrator for final authorization prior to proceeding with an association procedure.

“the display means displays information regarding the mobile station requesting authentication to a LAN administrator for final authorization of the authentication procedure when the mobile station is in the area in response to a notification of the presence of the authentication requesting mobile station

Hence, it is abundantly clear that in the present invention the display is located at the location of the LAN administrator, and also that the LAN administrator has a choice as to whether or not the requesting mobile station will be granted authentication for the purpose of going forward with the association procedure required to join the network.

On the other hand, Applicant respectfully submits that the mobile station and the so-called network manager in the Bjorklund reference are both apparatuses. Specifically, a display associated with the mobile station displays the so-called “universal address” (UA) data embedded in the mobile station at the time of its manufacture in response to the running of a diagnostics program (see Bjorklund, Column 4, lines 24-27). This UA information is forwarded from the mobile station to the network manager via its human operator (network administrator) “by telephone or any other written or verbal means”.

At that point, the Bjorklund Network Manager administrator receives the UA information from the operator of the mobile station (“e.g. by telephone, or by any other written/verbal means”) and the Network Manager administrator inputs the same into the Network Manager. The Network Manager in turn initiates a procedure for determining whether or not the mobile station will usurp the identification of another station already on the LAN. The output of the Network Manager (i.e., a name for the mobile station seeking authentication that will not conflict with the other active stations on the network) is then displayed on the network administrator’s console conveyed back to the mobile station in the same manner as the input of the UA information (e.g., by telephone, or by any other written/verbal means”) (see Bjorklund, col. 7, lines 14-15). Accordingly, the Bjorklund reference contemplates the permissible presence of human operators for both the mobile station and the Network Manager.

However, as was the case with the Hanson reference previously applied by the Examiner, nothing in the Bjorklund reference teaches, discloses or suggests that the human operator (network administrator) of the so-called Network Manager must (or for that matter can) separately and specifically authorize by the activation of an input means associated with a display on his console each association requested by a mobile station in a particular area as notified to him by the operator of that mobile station "by telephone or any other written/verbal means". Rather, the human operators of the mobile station and the Network Manager in the Bjorklund reference function as conduits through which information is transferred back and forth between the mobile station and the Network Manager. Further, the Network Administrator in the Bjorklund reference does not have the ability to deny the mobile station access to the network either "by telephone or any other written/verbal means" much less by input entered via an input means. Rather, the preliminary communication between the mobile station and the Network Manager in Bjorklund is solely for the purpose of ensuring that the mobile station does not have the same name as another mobile terminal on the network prior to the association of the mobile terminal with the network.

Thus, in the Bjorklund reference, a so-called UA is embedded in the programming of the mobile station upon its manufacture. When that mobile station desires to associate with the network, the UA information is displayed **at the mobile terminal** and that displayed information is forwarded to the Network Administrator permissibly by the human operator of the mobile terminal over a telephone line or some other convenient communication means. The so received UA information is input into the Network Manager by its human operator (the network administrator), and the Network Manager determines whether the mobile terminal can utilize its then present name on the network or must be assigned a different name because another terminal on the network already is using the name of the mobile terminal seeking association with the network. In the latter case, the Network Manager assigns a new name to the mobile station that is seeking authentication. Then, the output of the Network Manager is conveyed back to the mobile terminal via the network administrator and the mobile station operator, and based upon that input proceeds to associate itself with the LAN. As far as Applicant can determine, even though there are human operators in the communication loop between the mobile terminal and the Network Manager in the Bjorklund reference, there is no opportunity for either of those operators on his own initiative to veto an association sought by a particular mobile terminal with the network.

As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that the Bjorklund reference does not anticipate the present invention or otherwise render the present claim unpatentable. No input display of information regarding the mobile terminal is provided by Network Manager for viewing by the human Network Administrator as herein claimed, and there is no mechanism disclosed by Bjorklund that allows the Network Administrator (or the Network Manager) to deny access to the network by a requesting mobile terminal (even though the mobile terminal may be force to change its name in order to join the network). Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the Bjorklund reference fails to disclose all of the claimed elements of the claimed invention functioning together as claimed, and that therefore the Examiner's currently outstanding Final rejections are insufficient under either 35 USC 102(b) to support a finding that the presently pending claims of this application are not patentable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the currently outstanding Final rejections in this application be reconsidered, and that the presently pending claims of this application (i.e., Claims 1 and 2) be allowed in response to this communication.

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 28, 2005


SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No. 27,840

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
P. O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Customer No. 21874

Boston, MA 02205

518614